

INDIANA LEGISLATURE.

[Omissions and curtailments of this report for want of space in these columns will appear in an appendix to Volume XXII of the Brevier Legislative Reports.]

IN SENATE.

Thursday, Feb. 24, 1885—9:30 a. m.

APPELLATE COURT.

Mr. WEIR moved to concur in the minority report on his bill [S. 45—see page 105] for the establishment of three distinct Appellate Courts of three Judges each.

Mr. McCULLOUGH moved to substitute the majority report, in favor of one Court of five Judges, to meet at Indianapolis.

Mr. WEIR: Personally I am satisfied with either, but would like the Senate to decide between them.

Mr. RAHM: If we want a Court that will command itself to the people, we ought to favor the minority report. The difference in cost will be trifling, but the saving to litigants will be a large sum. It is not to prove successful the law can be repealed in two years from now.

Mr. McCULLOUGH: There are many very objectionable features in both measures. The bill ought not to be engrossed till printed.

Mr. WILLARD moved to make this bill a special order for 7:30 this evening.

Mr. SMITH: This Senate has worked as faithfully as any Senate Indiana has ever had, and I oppose making such a bill a special order for a night session.

Mr. WEIR: Senators can vote on this proposition now. It is a simple question as between the two plans.

Mr. McCULLOUGH: This is a matter of some considerable importance, and a decision as between two plans can better be determined by considering the provisions in the two bills, and they should be printed. Senators should not act hastily on this question. The provisions for the one court calls for a written argument; the three courts are to hear oral arguments.

On motion by Mr. YOCHE the bill was made a special order for Thursday at 10 o'clock.

SOLDIERS' ORPHANS' HOME.

Mr. SMITH, of Jennings, from the special Committee on Reorganization of the Knights-Town Institution, reported a bill which provides that the present Trustees shall be out of office on the passage of the bill; that the Governor shall then appoint new Trustees, who shall appoint a Superintendent, with the consent of the Governor. The Governor shall have power to remove Trustees and to appoint their successors; the Superintendent may be removed by either the Governor or Trustees.

Mr. SMITH, of Jennings: I make this motion because it is the unanimous desire of those who understand this matter. The time has come for the Legislature to take decided stand in reference to this matter. If the General Assembly adjourns without passing this measure the same men whose characters are stained by the investigation in progress will remain in charge. The present movement ought to go on and go on. If we do less than this we will be recreant to our trust. It will take but a few moments to pass this bill.

Mr. FOULKE: All will agree that some bill of this character should be passed, but we should know the provisions, and the bill should be printed.

Mr. WEIR: That bill simply disposes of the present trustees and authorizes the Governor to appoint others. That is all there is of it.

Mr. FOULKE: That is all I don't want.

Mr. JAGER: Two years ago the General Assembly thought fit to take their appointments from the Governor and placed it in the Legislature. There have always been open objections to bringing the management of this benevolent institution into politics. The only objection I have to this bill is that it does not require the Governor to appoint a non-partisan board. This seems to be the only way to escape from the present condition of affairs. The Democracy would not have been laboring under the cloud that now attaches to the management of the Knights-Town institution if the Board of Trustees had been made non-partisan. The benevolent institutions should be controlled by a law, not by the parties on their boards. The law enacted last year was proven to have been a blunder.

Mr. WINTER: I prepared this bill with little time and hurried manner by direction of the committee, and therefore it is made the special order for 7:30 o'clock this evening, and that the bill be printed.

LIFETIME CONVICTS.

Mr. Hoover's Lifetime Convict Encouragement bill [S. 254—see page 135] was read the second time.

Mr. WILLARD: This bill is a bill in behalf of better prison government. Nearly every State in the Union has passed what is called "good time laws."

The lifetime convicts are the only class exempted from the benefit effect of such legislation. The object of this bill is to carry some degree of hope to men who are left without any hope for the future. A man thus sent to the State Prison who has wealth or wealthy friends has some hopes, but the poor man has no ray of hope unless some such measure should be enacted into a law. This class of men ought to have extended to them a change to ameliorate their condition by good behavior during their confinement. This bill is in the nature of a ticket-of-leave system, nor can any man escape from the walls of the penitentiary under it without a certificate of recommendation from the warden and directors of the prison, after serving the term of twenty-five years, and if within the period of five years he misbehaves he is returned with a life sentence. Life prisoners were not the vilest of the criminal classes. Murder for gain was generally punished by death, the murderers committed for life were generally men who acted under strong and perhaps uncontrollable temporary impulse, sometimes were not justly convicted. I trust the bill may pass to its engrossment.

Mr. YOCHE: I am opposed to this bill. We have only two crimes for which the life sentence can be pronounced—treason and murder. In a great majority of cases where the prisoner should suffer the severe penalty of the law, under a false sentiment of the community, he manages to obtain a life sentence in the penitentiary. This bill would release such, with time earned by good behavior, in thirteen years and one month. It reduces the punishment so that a man that should be hung will only be imprisoned from thirteen to fifteen years. I am much more inclined to look after the welfare of the entire community than that of a criminal class. The times would probably be better were there a more severe execution of the criminal statutes. The law passed two years ago is sufficient mitigation of prison discipline. Murderers needed severe punishment rather than lighter. Wherever capital punishment has been abolished murder had increased. Wherever capital punishment was rigidly enforced murder was comparatively rare. Imprisonment for life should be the mildest punishment inflicted for murder.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks, questioned

whether the first section would not at once release all who have served the time prescribed in this bill, under the operations of the existing law.

Mr. WILLARD: The law of 1883 is not retroactive.

Mr. FOWLER: I hope this bill will not pass. It seems to be a dangerous bill. It would turn loose upon society a class of men possessing the lowest instincts of humanity, after confinement some thirteen or fifteen years. It certainly is not possible that our criminal laws need such amendment. If a little more hanging were done society would be much better off. The law as it stands is not any too strenuous on this class of prisoners.

Mr. MARSHALL: I feel that I want to be on the side of humanity, and will support the bill. I have learned that the Good Time bill passed in 1883 has worked wonders in our penitentiaries. Every man is put upon his good behavior. When you consider the length of term they will have to stay in prison, there are very few men who live in prison so long. That such may have something to live for, this bill should be passed. I think the great object for which a man is put in prison has been accomplished in about two years' confinement.

Mr. McCULLOUGH: I am opposed to this bill. It proposes a material change in the criminal laws. That class of community disposed to commit crime should be shown what punishment will follow crimes. I believe murder is the worst of crimes. It is not honorable under any circumstances. If convicted upon the charge, the doom of the convict should be the gallows or incarceration in prison for life. Say that such men shall be turned out, and such legislation will be condemned by the people.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph: There has been no bill that has come before a committee of this body that I have given so much consideration to. During the two terms I have been a member of the Prison Committee, I have conversed freely with the class of persons serving life sentences. At least eight of every ten have committed the crime upon momentary impulse, temporary insanity—these are they were drunk. This sympathy has brought upon me very much. The object of punishment is twofold—for punishment in its reality and for protection to the community. I have feared the effect that would come upon the community if the very class that a life sentence should be but fifteen years' imprisonment. I believe that 90 per cent. of such would go out and make good citizens. But I am afraid of the restraining effect upon community. This is a grave question and should be carefully considered. I believe it is not wise for the Legislature to enact that a jury shall not impose a life sentence. I move to amend so that "thirty years" be inserted instead of "twenty-five."

Mr. THOMPSON: If punishment is for reformation, the punishment heretofore inflicted has proven a failure. Men have served five and ten years, and have come out worse than when they went in. Instead of turning them out reformed, they are turned out with the spirit of devils. Many fires in cities are attributable to men who have served long terms in the penitentiary and feel they are out from other human beings. I believe hope never should be removed from the human breast. Where such is the case that man is no friend to humanity. I hope the bill will pass. I may need some amendment, but let Indiana take a step in advance in this matter.

The amendment was agreed to upon a division—affirmative 21, negative not called.

The Senate ordered the bill engrossed for a third reading by yeas 25, nays 21.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks, explaining his negative vote: I believe it is a too radical change and would result in turning a great many life convicts loose.

THE WIDOW OF EDWIN MAY.

Mr. Thompson's bill [S. 178] to appropriate \$10,000 to Sarah May, widow of Edwin May, for services as architect of the new State house, was read the second time.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph, explained the circumstances of the claim: The claim is based upon equity. There is a dime due upon the contract for the construction of the State house, and the State-house architect is the State-house architect. The State-house architect is the State-house architect. The State-house architect is the State-house architect.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. OVERSTREET moved to amend by striking out \$10,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$25,000, and to strike out the clause as a whole without any personal examination. Since that time I have taken the pains to ascertain what would be right. In point of law there is nothing due, but inasmuch as the commissioners were able to let the contract at a more reasonable price, whatever was saved by that transaction I am willing the claimant shall have. The Commission says if Mr. May had lived and performed his contract \$4,000 would have been given and there is no legal obligation to pay a single dollar on this claim.

Mr. SMITH, of Jay: I have come to the conclusion that this is a just claim and ought to be paid, every dollar of it. It is not right for a sovereign State to refuse to allow its claim preferred by any citizen.

Mr. McCULLOUGH: While it is the duty of the Legislature to devise just claims, the Legislature should see that no unjust claims are allowed. The State-house Commission has the full power under the law to pay any debt contracted on account of the construction of that building. Then, let them pay all such just claims and not throw the responsibility on the Legislature.

Mr. FOULKE: Until there is some means of determining whether a claim is just or not, we should not refuse a just claim because some unjust ones have been allowed. There is more danger in refusing to pass this bill to the engrossment than to order it engrossed. This is an unsatisfactory way to settle the justice of claims, but we have no better way. The State-house Commissioners know better than any man here whether this claim is just or not. The State can afford to do right whether it can be compelled to do right or not.

Mr. JAGER: I had the honor two years ago to be the chairman of the committee which considered this claim, and I took excruciating pains to examine into it. It is unfortunate there is no tribunal before which citizens can go with their claims against the State. This is the only form where claimants can pass their claims. No man hearing the testimony could do otherwise, were he sitting as a juror, than to give judgment for the full amount of this claim. I know of no other way to ascertain facts for our guidance than to have a committee investigate and report as to the matter. I bottom this claim on what is right and what is just, and I support this bill and support it cordially. When he had concluded, he demanded the previous question.

The Senate seconded the demand, and under its operations the motion to amend the bill by reducing the sum to \$4,000 was rejected by yeas 15, nays 34.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks, in explanation of his vote, said he should vote upon the recommendation of the committee and the State-house Commissioners.

Mr. FAULKNER said he did not believe the State owes one dollar of this claim he should vote "no."

Mr. FOWLER: I shall vote for the amendment because it is preferable to the \$10,000, but on the final passage I shall vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. ELLERS, when his name was called, said: There has been no testimony or argu-

ment showing the State owes Mrs. May \$10,000 or \$5,000; therefore I vote "no."

Mr. WINTER: There is no question that has embarrassed me more than this matter since the beginning of this session. The State should not deal with her subjects as one private citizen would with another. I don't think a legal right enters into this question, but I have no doubt this claimant has a moral right to \$4,000. The argument here has made me think she probably should have more than \$4,000; therefore I vote "no."

The bill was ordered engrossed for the third reading by yeas 24, nays 24.

The Lieutenant Governor, in giving the casting vote, said: I feel under the circumstances, the State of Indiana can not afford to pay the debt of debts, therefore I vote "no."

Mr. FAULKNER: Acting as a sworn juror to do justice, if I thought it just, if everybody voted against it I should vote for it, but as I don't think it is just and as the committee all concur there is no legal obligation to pay this sum, therefore I vote "no."

Mr. OVERSTREET felt that \$4,000 could be allowed without injury to the State, but feeling that \$10,000 is not supported as a claim against the State he should vote "no."

Mr. YOCHE: Two years ago I voted against this allowance, and is more satisfied now that upon all questions of paying claims the State should not screen herself under the fact that she can not be sued; but such things should be decided as they are between man and man, the doom of the convict should be the gallows or incarceration in prison for life. Say that such men shall be turned out, and such legislation will be condemned by the people.

So the vote was then announced as above.

So the bill was ordered engrossed.

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL.

Mr. Schol's bill [S. 330] to appropriate \$25,000 a year to the State Normal School was read the second time.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks: A bill has been fully considered by the friends of the school, which he offered as a substitute for this bill.

Mr. YOCHE thought a provision to strike this out of the general fund would be the proper way.

Mr. FOWLER: This bill ought not to be engrossed. It seems to have for its object the appropriation out of the 16 per cent. levy for a school purposes. That is part of the common school fund of the State. This 16 per cent. levy has the same object as the common school fund, and this bill proposes to divert \$25,000 of that fund to this one school at Terre Haute; and this diversion might just as well be made to other schools in the State until the common school fund is absorbed that is, the Legislature ought to amend so that the money shall come from the general fund. Let us see what amount is expended for professors and teachers there. The first item is \$3,000 for the President, who is President of the State University does not get a large salary. (Says) Nineteen professors are teaching in that normal school. The number is too large and the compensation is too high, and that is why it is this school asks an additional appropriation every year. Twenty thousand dollars is all the Legislature ought to vote, and not another dollar more than the Legislature has been appropriating.

Mr. FOULKE: The State Normal School is an adjunct to the common school system of the State. There is no way in which the common school system can be aided better than by furnishing it good and trained teachers. This school is growing from year to year, and will need large appropriations as the years roll by.

Mr. MCINTOSH: It would be very wrong to pass this bill. I read a short extract from Governor Hendricks' last message to the Legislature, prefacing recommendations as to the school system of the State. This bill comes directly in the line of perverting the common school fund from the purposes for which it was intended. It is a bill showing that the State Normal School had but few in attendance in comparison with other normal schools in this State. This State Normal School is a Terre Haute and Vigo County school. He demanded the money belonging to the children of the State be allowed to go to them. I hope this bill will never be engrossed and never passed.

Mr. OVERSTREET would not cast a vote knowingly that would tend to cripple the common schools of the State. He asked why it is these large salaries are paid. In a college in our town there are professors who do as good work as any in the State, on a salary of \$1,000 a year. I have heard no good reason stated why there is \$5,000 more asked for than for the professors in the common school enough, but desire to have a good reason for the additional appropriation. The people are beginning to feel that this is too expensive a luxury.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Hendricks: I can hardly understand the argument made against this bill. While not as well informed on this subject as he would like to be, it is thought the better plan is to raise this fund out of the fund which is raised by special taxation.

Mr. YOCHE: This bill would be taking away \$25,000 of schooling from the children of this State.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It would make such a slight difference in the terms of the schools in the State—one half day in each school district—that it is thought to be less objectionable to take the fund as proposed. Those in charge are indifferent as to what fund the appropriation comes from. The trustees of this institution are the best judges of the money needed to run the school. More is needed now than at first, of course. If the appropriation is too much, tell us why.

Pending the discussion

The Senate adjourned till 9:30 o'clock to-morrow.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Thursday, Feb. 24, 1885—9 a. m.

The session was opened with prayer by Elder E. S. France, a Representative from Rush County.

The SPEAKER directed a call of the House, which being taken discovered eight members present and answering to their names.

LIMIT OF DEBATE.

Mr. Dittmore's motion to limit debate to five minutes, submitted yesterday, was taken up and after considerable debate many motions to amend, the resolution was indefinitely postponed.

UNITED STATES ARSENAL GROUNDS.

Mr. WILLIAMS offered a concurrent resolution instructing Senators and Indiana Congressmen to secure a donation by the United States to the State of Indiana of the arsenal grounds located near Indianapolis for educational purposes.

It was read the first time and referred to the Committee on Rights and Privileges.

U. S. STATE TAX.

Whereas, The Government of the United States imposed a direct tax upon the heads of her inhabitants to assist in defraying the expenses of the war for the suppression of the rebellion; and

Whereas, The State of Indiana paid her full assessment of said tax amounting to several hundred thousand dollars; and

Whereas, The insurrectionary States yet owe to the United States a large sum of money, and some of the non-insurrectionary States and Territories yet owe to the United States two hundred thousand dollars; and

Whereas, It is deemed inexpedient under the present flourishing condition of the Government

Treasury to coerce payment of said taxes yet unpaid, therefore—

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, That our Representatives in Congress be requested and our Senators be instructed to vote for and use their influence to pass a law releasing the inhabitants of the States in which these taxes have not been paid from all liability, and returning to the States which have paid these taxes the full amount paid.

It was laid on the table.

NEW PROPOSITIONS.

The following described bills were introduced during the first time and severally referred to appropriate committees:

By Mr. BAILEY [H. R. 491] to appropriate \$40,000 for the straightening of El River in Clay County.

By Mr. ROBINSON [H. R. 495] for the relief of George D. Armstrong, Trustee of Perry Township, Clay County.

By Mr. STALEY [H. R. 496] to reorganize the Soldiers' Orphans' Home, giving the Governor sole power of appointment and removal of Trustees.

By Mr. FLOYD [H. R. 498] providing for the appointment of three Fish Commissioners.

By Mr. LINNVILLE [H. R. 500] to prevent the spread of hog cholera.

By Mr. BARNEY [H. R. 502] authorizing County Commissioners to open books for recording subscription to the proposed soldiers' monument.

By Mr. MOCK, of Harrison, [H. R. 505] providing for redistributing the school fund.

By Mr. WILLIAMS [H. R. 506] to repeal the act creating the office of Commissioner of Supreme Court.

By Mr. PENDLETON [H. R. 508] fixing the salary of township assessors and deputies in cities of 50,000 inhabitants at \$3 a day.

By Mr. SCHLEY [H. R. 511] authorizing cities of 25,000 inhabitants to tax hucksters, peddlers, etc.

By Mr. OVERMAN [H. R. 512] limiting liquor licenses to be charged by cities to \$200.

By Mr. ENGLE [H. R. 514] making it unlawful for railroad companies to give free passes to judicial or legislative officers.

By Mr. GLAZEBROOK [H. R. 516] to prohibit the killing of snipes on the part of the State.

By Mr. BUTZ [H. R. 517] for the protection of trees and shrubbery.

By Mr. SAYRE [H. R. 518] to prohibit corporations from taking any forced contributions from their employees.

By Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe, [H. R. 519] to compel county officers to produce public records in court when so ordered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

A message from the Senate announcing that it had made certain amendments to the Deficiency Appropriation bill [H. R. 327] was read, and the House refused to concur in the amendments and decided to have a conference committee, the Speaker appointing five such committees on the part of the House Messrs. McMullen and Adams.

HOUSE BILLS PASSED.

Mr. Murphy's bill [H. R. 90] empowering voluntary associations to be incorporated for the purpose of establishing homes for the care of aged and indigent females and orphans was read the third time and passed the House by yeas 10, nays 10.

Mr. Jameson's bill [H. R. 153] authorizing the acceptance of surety companies as sureties upon bonds required by the laws of the State was read the third time and passed by yeas 16, nays 10.

Then came a recess for dinner.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. Jameson's bill [H. R. 154] for the regulation of foreign surety companies doing business in this State, prescribing the duties of agents, etc., was read the third time and passed by yeas 10, nays 10.

On motion by Mr. McMullen, Mr. Farwell's bill [H. R. 167] appropriating \$1,134 for payment of the claim of Carlon & Hollenbeck for binding volumes 17, 18, 19 and 20 of the Brevier Legislative Report under an order from the Bureau of Public Printing, was read the third time and passed the House by yeas 90, nays 0.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROPRIATION.

Mr. Williams moved to take up Mr. Patterson's Congressional Appropriation bill [H. R. 422] and on that motion demanded the previous question.

The demand was seconded by yeas 47, nays 45.

The main question was ordered by yeas 49, nays 44, and the main question was ordered put by yeas 53, nays 49, and the bill passed by yeas 53, nays 49.

The following protest was filed:

Mr. Speaker: We protest against the action of the majority of this House on the passage of House Appropriation bill No. 422, in continuing to suppress, throttle and gag the minority by using untruthful, malicious and cowardly rule that have disgraced the General Assembly of a free State, thereby violating a free, fair and honest election of the people of the State.

The following appeal was presented:

Mr. Speaker: We, the undersigned, hereby appeal from the decision of the Chair, striking out House bill No. 422 out of the order. The House not having agreed thereto by a two-thirds vote. Warren G. Sawyer, A. Adams.

On motion by Mr. BROWNING (Mr. McMullen taking the chair) the appeal was laid on the table by yeas 55, nays 34.

The House adjourned.

Real Estate Transfers.

The following deeds were recorded Tuesday, February 24, as reported by Stoe & Bernhardt, abstractors, Nos. 12 and 15 Thorpe Block, Telephone 1048:

David K. Smith to Wm. H. Shank, warranty deed to lot 25 in Julian et al.'s subdivision and addition to the city of Indianapolis. \$500 00

Charles L. Hendricks and wife to Henry Witte, warranty deed to lot 11, in Chas. Hendricks, Sr.'s addition to Columbus. \$240 00

James H. Rudell et al. to Sheffield H. Whitely, warranty deed to lot 6 in Kendall & Vinson's Park Place addition to the city of Indianapolis. \$300 00

Peter Moor Cochrane and wife to Mrs. M. C. Schaeffer, quit claim deed to lots 37 and 38, in block 3, in North Indianapolis. \$20 00

Annus the last and wife to Julia A. Sears, warranty deed to lot 41, in block 2 in Ramsey's subdivision of block 2, and 3 in Hatching et al.'s Brookside subdivision of part of outlots 50 and 55 in the city of Indianapolis. \$1,700 00

William Wisco, reverter, to Willis J. Geisel, receiver's deed to lots 38, 39 and 40, in Downey's Arsenal Heights addition to the city of Indianapolis. \$36 00

Ben W. Ritter, commissioner, to Charles W. Ritter, commissioner's deed to part of the east half of lot 3, in section 4, township 16 north of range 4 east, containing 9 acres, more or less. \$40 00

Frank J. Howard et al. ex-authors to W. E. Whitehead, executor's deed to blocks 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27, in Johnson & Brown's addition to Northwood. \$2,000 00

South A. Shields and husband to Michael J. Shields, warranty deed to lot 1, in Ingram Fletcher's subdivision of lots 1 and 2, in Fletcher's Oak Hill suburb to the city of Indianapolis. \$400 00

Conveyances, 10: consideration. \$5,536 00

Plant Lice on Fruit Trees.

(American Agriculturist.)

Many of our subscribers complain that ants are doing much damage to their fruit trees. Ants may be to some extent injurious, but their being found on the peach, cherry, apple and other fruit trees in such large numbers is due to the presence of countless plant lice (Aphides) on the leaves and young twigs of those trees. Ants feed upon the sweet juices that exude from the

bodies of the plant lice. They sometimes bestow great care upon the plant lice, protecting and providing for them as we do for a cow, and for much the same reason. If the lice are removed the ants will seek their food elsewhere. This may be done by showing the trees with tobacco water, or an emulsion of kerosene. With small trees the limbs may be bent down and dipped in a bucket of the liquid.

A Good Rat Trap.

An effective rat trap is made as follows: Take a hollow log, from six to eight inches in diameter, and eight to ten feet in length. Make a plug of wood to fit one end of the hollow, and fasten it in securely. Make a second plug to fit the other end of the log, and lay it aside in the barn. Place this log upon the floor of the barn, so that it will be convenient for the rats to find and enter. It will not be long before they will begin to carry in litter, and to make use of the log as a hiding-place in the day time. You can see how they are progressing by noticing the signs at the entrance to the log. Do not disturb the log for a week or more. When a large number of rats are hiding in the log, drive in the extra plug and take the log out of doors, away from any building or pile of rubbish that the rats could escape to. Now call all hands with clubs, and let one person with a pole drive the rats out of the log. Or send in a terrier dog to rouse them. There will be a lively time for awhile. Kill all the vermin and set the "trap" again.

"Maryland, My Maryland."

"Pretty Wives,
Lovely daughters and noble men."

"My farm lies in a rather low and miserable situation, and

"My wife!"

"Who?"

"Was a very pretty blonde!"

Twenty years ago, became

"Sallow!"

"Hollow-eyed!"

"Withered and aged!"

Before her time, from

"Malarial vapors, though she made no particular complaint, not being of the grumpy kind, yet causing me great uneasiness."